

It is respectfully submitted that the method as recited in claim 19 recites a method of manufacturing of a semiconductor apparatus that is not restrictable from elected claim 1. In particular, claim 19 contains all the limitations of claim 1 and cannot be used to make other and different products from claim 1, and the semiconductor apparatus according to claim 1 cannot be made by another and materially different method from that recited in claim 19. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to MPEP §806.05(f). Accordingly, claims 19-25 are not distinct inventions from claims 1-4 and 6-12.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C §102(b) over Thompson (U.S. Patent No. 5,293,067). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that Thompson does not disclose at least a plurality of leads radially extending from a peripheral area toward a central area of the substrate main body, as recited in claims 1 and 7. See Fig. 1 of Thompson, for example.

Instead, Thompson discloses an integrated circuit chip carrier assembly, comprising a semiconductor device 10 attached to a circuitry pattern 18 on a first side of a circuit carrying substrate 16. As set forth in col. 2, lines 61-65 of Thompson, for example, the substrate 16 also contains other circuitry 20 that interconnects pads to the conductive thru-holes or vias 22 in the substrate. However, as shown in Fig. 1, for example, the circuitry 20 extends in randomized directions, extending away from the center, toward the outside, and the like. That is, contrary to the Office Action's assertions, Thompson fails to disclose the features recited in claims 1 and 7.


Unlike Thompson, claims 1 and 7 recite a plurality of leads radially extending from a peripheral area toward a central area of the substrate main body. Accordingly, the leads may be disposed with high density, for example. Thompson is silent as to such features.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 7 are not anticipated by Thompson. Because claims 2-4 and 6 depend from claim 1 and claims 8-12 depend from claim 7, claims 2-4, 6 and 8-12 also are not anticipated by Thompson. At least because claim 5 is canceled, the rejection of claim 5 is moot. Applicant thus request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C §102(b).

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this matter, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Thu Anh Dang
Registration No. 41,544

JAO:TAD/sld

Date: December 20, 2000

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400